

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0063671 by Knapp.

5 According to MPEP 2112, IV, the Examiner must provide rationale or evidence
tending to show inherency, such as “the fact that a certain result or characteristic may
occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that
result or characteristic.” and “Inherency, however, may not be established by
probability or possibility. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given
10 set of circumstances is not sufficient.” Therefore, it is not sufficient for the
Examiner to submit that the first and second driver input the same image data to this
third scanning band if the particular image to be displayed in a frame calls for image
data within the third scanning band to be the same / identical.

15 Applicant also asserts that in the present application, no matter what kind of
image it is and whether the pixel units in the scanning band are positioned above or
below the disconnecting points, the first and second data driver would always input
the same image data to the third scanning band. The above-mentioned distinction is
not limited to the particular image, as remarked by the Examiner’s response.
20 Reconsideration of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 is respectfully requested.


Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this
case.

25

30

Appl. No. 10/605,791
Amdt. dated January 10, 2008
Reply to Office action of December 05, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/10/2008

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)